



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,486	10/31/2003	Eric Anderson	200207252-1	3149
22879 7590 05/22/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER RADTKE, MARK A	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,486

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON, ERIC

Examiner

Mark A. X Radtke

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1 March 2007 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 1 March 2007, claim(s) 3, is/are cancelled and claim(s) 1, 12-14 and 19-24 is/are amended per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-2 and 4-24 are presently pending in the application, of which, claim(s) 1, 12 and 19-24 is/are presented in independent form.

3. It is noted that claim 1, as amended, at line 5 contains formatting that does not conform to standard practice. The phrase "one or more portions of the" is enclosed in single brackets. Typically, strings of five or fewer characters are enclosed in double brackets (e.g., line 7 of claim 1) to indicate their deletion (see 37 CFR 1.121(c)(2)). For the purposes of examination, the phrase "one or more portions of the" at line 5 of claim

Art Unit: 2165

1 will be given patentable weight and the brackets will be ignored, because the phrase was not deleted from other independent claims (see, for example, claim 19). If Applicant wishes to delete the phrase, Applicant should do so in the response to this Action using standard "strike-through" style. In either case, it is requested that Applicant clarify Applicant's reason for enclosing the phrase in single brackets in the 1 March 2007 filing. It is suggested that Applicant delete the single brackets (i.e., "[[]]one or more portions of the[[]]").

4. A similar problem is noted in claims 13-14. For the purposes of examination, the portions of those claims enclosed in brackets will be considered deleted. It is requested that Applicant furnish an updated copy of the claims that correctly deletes the previously presented portions of those claims (i.e., "strike-through"). Also, the language in claims 13-14, as amended, may require changes; the phrase "results [...] includes intermediate status result" is ungrammatical. These problems make it difficult to ascertain the scope of the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-15 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,856,993), and further in view of Berliner ("CVS II: Parallelizing Software Development" by B. Berliner, Proceedings of the USENIX Winter 1990 Technical Conference, available online at <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/berliner90cvs.html>).

As to claim 1, Verma et al. teaches a method of creating a filesystem with transaction based functionality (see Abstract), comprising:

receiving an indicator to initiate a transaction for files stored in one or more portions of the filesystem (see column 10, lines 8-10, "mark the thread/process as transacted" and column 10, lines 20-24, "copyFile");

processing the text-based commands written to the control file (see column 2, lines 57-59 and column 3, lines 3-6); and

operating on the one or more portions of the pseudo-filesystem within a transaction according to the text-based commands (see column 3, lines 3-6).

Verma et al. does not explicitly teach duplicating the filesystem within a pseudo-filesystem; and

creating a control text file that provides a textual filesystem interface and receives text-based commands to operate on the pseudo-filesystem.

However, Berliner teaches duplicating the filesystem within a pseudo-filesystem (see section 2.1, "The CVS Program", paragraph 2, number 3, "symbolic mapping of names" and see section 2.3, "Location Independent Module Database"); and

creating a control text file that provides a textual filesystem interface and receives text-based commands to operate on the pseudo-filesystem (See section 2.2, "Tracking Third-Party Source Distributions", "**checkin** program". Berliner anticipates the use of scripts, which are equivalent to "a control text file". Furthermore, the use of scripts to automate certain tasks is extremely well-known in the art of Unix systems programming. See, for example, "Running Arbitrary Scripts Under CVS" by J. Vesperman. Furthermore, to an application, the Unix command line ("stdin") is indistinguishable from a text file).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified Verma et al. by the teaching of Berliner because "other operating systems and/or file systems may implement and benefit from the present invention" (see Verma et al., column 6, lines 17-19).

As to claim 2, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the duplicating is performed lazily (see column 2, lines 59-65 and column 23, "Deferred Redo Alternative").

As to claim 4, Verma et al., as modified, teaches further comprising:
completing the transaction upon receipt of a text-based command associated with terminating the transaction (see column 8, lines 26-28).

As to claim 5, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the text-based commands include functional equivalent commands associated with terminating the transaction (see column 7, lines 23-26, "aborted") and selected from a set of commands for performing one of the following functions: delete directory (see column 17, lines 3-7), delete filesystem (see column 17, lines 3-7, "recursive delete"), and abort (see column 7, lines 23-26).

As to claim 6, Verma et al., as modified, teaches further comprising:
updating the filesystem with the updates performed on the pseudo-filesystem when the transaction has completed (see column 8, lines 26-28).

As to claim 7, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the updates are performed upon receipt of an indication to commit the transaction (see column 8, lines 26-28).

As to claim 8, Verma et al., as modified, teaches further comprising:
creating a status text file that provides text-based status results from operations performed on the pseudo-filesystem (see column 2, lines 57-59, "actual data write details of the transaction").

As to claim 9, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the indicator to initiate the transaction results from the creation of a directory within a pseudo-filesystem (see column 27, lines 64-67).

As to claim 10, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the transaction ensures atomic updates to the filesystem in accordance with modifications made to the pseudo-filesystem and related files during the transaction (see column 6, lines 24-26).

As to claims 11 and 18, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein a user assists in reconciliation of conflicts between updates in the pseudo-filesystems (See column 29, lines 37-45. Depending on when the non-transacted user releases the resource, a file handle in conflict will not be deleted, thus resolving a resource conflict).

As to claim 12, Verma et al. teaches a method of interfacing with a filesystem (see Abstract) comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 13, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the text-based status results in the status file includes intermediate status result (see column 2, lines 57-59, "actual data write details of the transaction").

As to claim 14, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein the text-based status results in the status file includes final status results (see column 2, lines 57-59, "actual data write details of the transaction").

As to claim 15, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein receiving a text-based command includes functional equivalent commands selected from a set including: change root directory (The "mount" command is all well-known command in NTFS. Mount points can be partitions or folders within an existing partition. See <http://support.microsoft.com/?kbid=205524>), select concurrency control type (See column 6, lines 56-59. Any kind of concurrency control system can be used via interfaces), select isolation level (See column 6, lines 48-51. Processes, file handles or files must be selected before they are treated as transactional operations. Disabling or enabling transactions is a selection of isolation level.), commit transaction (see column 8, lines 26-28), and abort transaction (see column 7, lines 23-26).

As to claim 17, Verma et al., as modified, teaches wherein determining the one or more data dependencies includes using lock-based concurrency control (LBCC) to control pending read and write operations to the pseudo-filesystem, the filesystem and one or more corresponding files associated with the pseudo-filesystem and filesystem respectively (see column 11, line 49 – column 12, line 18).

As to claim 19, Verma et al. teaches a computer program product for creating a filesystem with transaction based functionality, tangibly stored on a computer-readable medium, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor (see Abstract) to:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 20, Verma et al. teaches a computer program product for interfacing with a filesystem, tangibly stored on a computer-readable medium, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor (see Abstract) to:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 21, Verma et al. teaches an apparatus that creates a filesystem with transaction based functionality (see Abstract) comprising:

a processor (see figure 1, element 21);

a memory (see figure 1, element 25) having instructions capable of being executed on the processor...

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 22, Verma et al. teaches an apparatus that interfaces with a filesystem (see Abstract), comprising:

a processor (see figure 1, element 21);
a memory (see figure 1, element 25) having instructions capable of being executed on the processor...

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 23, Verma et al. teaches an apparatus for creating a filesystem with transaction based functionality (see Abstract), comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 24, Verma et al. teaches an apparatus for interfacing with a filesystem (see Abstract), comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma et al., as modified, as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Kung et al. ("On optimistic methods for concurrency control", ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS), vol. 6, issue 2, pages 213-226. Published June 1981).

As to claim 16, Verma et al., as modified, still does not teach wherein determining the one or more data dependencies includes using optimistic concurrency control (OCC) to control pending read and write operations to the pseudo-filesystem, the filesystem and one or more corresponding files associated with the pseudo-filesystem and filesystem respectively.

Kung et al. teaches wherein determining the one or more data dependencies includes using optimistic concurrency control (OCC) to control pending read and write operations to the pseudo-filesystem, the filesystem and one or more corresponding files associated with the pseudo-filesystem and filesystem respectively (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified Verma et al., as modified, by the teaching of Kung et al. for the benefit of providing an external transaction service (See Verma et al., column 6, lines 59-64, where one type of transaction service, MS-DTC, is suggested. Furthermore, Examiner notes that there are 171 citations listed on the ACM Portal, indicating that the method is well-known in the art).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 1 March 2007 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

In response to Applicant's arguments that "Verma does not describe or suggest "duplicating the filesystem within a pseudo-filesystem", the Examiner respectfully disagrees and reasserts the position argued on page 11 of the Final Action filed 1 November 2006. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, the current rejection relies on the feature as it is taught by Berliner.

Additional References

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to transactional file management in general:

"Running Arbitrary Scripts Under CVS" by J. Vesperman.
"Version Control with Subversion", Chapters 1-3, by B. Collins-Sussman et al.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.


Art Unit: 2165

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr

13 May 2007


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100